

V. REMARKS

Entry of the Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because the Amendment: a) places the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; b) does not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration because the Amendment amplifies issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; and c) places the application in better form for appeal, should an Appeal be necessary. The Amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented because it is made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. The amendments to the subject claims do not incorporate any new subject matter into the claims. Thus, entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 USC 102 (e) as being anticipated by Loose (U.S. Patent No. 6,517,433). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claim is canceled and, as a result, the rejection as applied thereto is now moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Loose in view of Muir (WO 3039699) and further in view of Ozaki et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0031658). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is amended to add the following features:

- (1) the reflection device is constructed from a reflection film;
- (2) the reflection film has a reflection area and plural non-reflection areas;
- (3) the reflection area reflects light from the light guide device toward the liquid crystal panel; and
- (4) the non-reflection areas, each of which corresponds to each reel, are made light transmittable.

It is respectfully submitted that none on the applied art, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the features of claim 1 as amended. Specifically, none on the applied art, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the above-specified reflection film. In brief, the above-specified reflection film is not at all disclosed or taught in Loose, Muir or Ozaki. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the features of the applied art because such combination would not result in the claimed invention. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the applied art.

Claim 2 is canceled and, as a result, the rejection as applied thereto is now moot.

Claims 3-6 depend from claim 1 and includes all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features they recite.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Newly-added claims 8-11 also include features not shown in the applied art.

The features of claim 8 lie in the following points:

(1) an image displayed on the second display device is generated by synthesizing at least a first splite image with a priority order and a second splite image with a priority order;

(2) the priority order of the first splite image is higher than the priority order of the second splite image;

(3) the plural symbol display areas of the second display device through which the first display device is seen and recognized, are realized by displaying the first splite image with the priority order higher than the priority order of the second splite image; and

(4) the first splite image is superimposed with the second splite image so that the first splite image screens the second splite image based on the priority order of the first and the second images.

The above listed aspects directed to the new claim 8 are not at all disclosed or taught in Loose, Muir and Ozaki. Since the claim 8 is not obvious over those three cited references, these claims are patentable.

The new claims 9-11 correspond to some of the pending dependent claims dependent on the new claim 8.

Further, Applicants assert that there are also reasons other than those set forth above why the pending claims are patentable. Applicants hereby reserve the right to submit those other reasons and to argue for the patentability of claims not explicitly addressed herein in future papers.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper or if a Petition for Extension of Time is required for timely acceptance of the same,

SHO-0026
(80380-00260)


Application No.: 10/697,254

the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 18-0013 for any such fees and Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 29, 2007

By:


Carl Schaukowitch
Reg. No. 29,211

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
1233 20th Street, N.W. Suite 501
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 955-3750
Fax: (202) 955-3751
Customer No. 23353

Enclosure(s): Amendment Transmittal
 Petition for Extension of Time (three months)

DC280432.DOC